

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,724	11/24/2003	Mitsuro Atobe	9319K-000606	2761
27572	7590 09/27/2006		EXAMINER	
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.			DHINGRA, RAKESH KUMAR	
P.O. BOX 828 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1763	
			DATE MAILED: 09/27/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/720,724	ATOBE ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Rakesh K. Dhingra	1763				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim (rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE.	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status .						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 Ju	<u>ly 2006</u> .					
·	<u> </u>					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 5 and 13 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>5 and 13</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).				
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior						
application from the International Bureau						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list		ed.				
Attachment(s)	"—···	(DTO 412)				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal F	Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) 🔲 Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/720,724

Art Unit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/21/06 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3, 5 and 13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as explained hereunder.

Applicant has amended independent claim 5, 13 and deleted claim 3.

New reference has been found (US PGPUB 2003/0150384, Baude et al) and (US patent No. 6,171,736, Hirayanagi et al) that when combined read on limitations of claim 5 and 13. Accordingly claims 5 and 13 have been rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as explained below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly

Application/Control Number: 10/720,724

Art Unit: 1763

owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 5, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baude et al (US PGPUB No. 2003/0150384) in view of Hirayanagi et al (US Patent No. 6,171,736).

Regarding Claim 5: Baude et al teach an apparatus (Figures 5-7) that includes a vacuum chamber 50 with a deposition unit (evaporation source) 54, a mask 10 J/K and deposition substrate 52 and controls deposition in a predetermined manner.

Baude et al further teach that an electrostatic charge may be applied to the mask 10K by electrostatic techniques (electrostatic chucking mechanism) to address the sag problem when working with large size masks (paragraphs 0033-0040).

Baude et al do not teach mask including silicon and also do not expressely teach mask having electrodes for generating electrostatic attraction, and the connected wiring (unit for supplying charge to the mask pattern).

Hirayanagi et al teach an apparatus (Figures 1, 5) that includes silicon mask assembly having mask patterns 11a, 11b and provided with electrodes 83a-83h that are secured to the mask retention member 82 by using electrostatic charge (column 4, line 60 to column 5, line 36). Hirayanagi et al does not expressely teach associated wiring (including unit) for providing electric power to electrodes on the mask but the same would be obviously required for generating electrostatic charge.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide electrodes with connected wiring for generating electrostatic attraction as taught by Hirayanagi et al in the

Application/Control Number: 10/720,724

Art Unit: 1763

apparatus of Baude et al et al when using non flexible masks (like masks made from silicon) for holding

deposition substrate without sag.

Regarding Claim 13: Baude et al in view of Hirayanagi et al teach all limitations of the claim (as

explained above) including that apparatus of the invention can be used for manufacture of display panels

by depositing organic compound (paragraphs 0003, 0006, 0027, 0029).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Rakesh K. Dhingra whose telephone number is (571)-272-5959. The examiner can

normally be reached on 8:30 -6:00 (Monday - Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on (571)-272-1435. The fax phone number for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available

through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer

Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR

CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Rakesh Dhingra

Parviz Hassanzadeh

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1763